UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,445	08/09/2001	Mduduzi Keswa	053305-5001	2941

9629   7590   12/15/2004

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 August 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-13, 15-19, 21-25, and 27-29* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,14,20, and 26* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 08/09/2001.

2.   Claims 1-29 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 24 are independent

claims.

Drawings

3.   The drawings were received on 08/09/2001. These drawings are accepted.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claims 4, 14, 20, and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1, 10, 11, and 18, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication

Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001).

Regarding independent claim 1, Silva discloses a method in which a user

request is received by a voice server and in response a HTTP request (Page 3,

paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). The HTML document is received in response to the

request and the document is translated into VoiceXML, at which point a voice server

converts it to audible form and presents it to the user (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of

Silva).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Silva discloses a method in which an HTML

parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-formed HTML documents (Page 4, paragraphs

0031-0032 of Silva).

Regarding independent claim 11, the claim is substantially similar as claim 1.

Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Silva discloses a method in which a segment

of the HTML document is extracted and the tags in the segment are processed (Page 5,

paragraphs 0038-0040). The largest sequence of tags is found and a plurality of

segments is formed from the original segment (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and

Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 of Silva).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Silva discloses a method in which a text

summarization is performed on a plurality of processed text sections of HTML page in

which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5,

paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). Silva also

discloses that the HTML document is converted to an object structure (Page 4,

paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva)

Regarding dependent claim 23, Silva discloses a method of making an HTTP

connection and accessing a URL, then parsing the document including the header

(Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva). Silva

also discloses a method in which an HTML parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-

formed HTML documents (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 and Page 4, paragraphs

0031-0032 of Silva). Silva also discloses that the HTML document is converted to an

object structure (Page 4, paragraphs 0031-0032 of Silva).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 8, 9, 21, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number

2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 8 and 9, Silva discloses a method in which a user

profile, which includes user default options, is interpreted from a database (Page 3,

paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server

pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java

Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it

was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time

the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claims 21 and 22, the claims incorporate substantially

similar subject matter as claims 8 and 9. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same

rationale as claims 8 and 9.

9.   Claims 2, 5-7, 12, 15-17, 24, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication

Number 2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter

Johnson, US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0165955, filed on May 2,

2001).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Silva does not disclose a method of partitioning

the HTML document into a plurality of text sections and link sections. However,

Johnson discloses a method in which an HTML document is partitioned into a plurality

of text sections and link sections (Page 2, paragraphs 0028-0029 and Page 5,

paragraphs 0067-0069). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is

well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server

Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made and it would have allowed for each section to be analyzed and processed under different standards.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 6, Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Silva discloses a method in which a plurality of audible cues available for audible selection (earcons) is provided to differentiate between sections of the HTML document (Page 8, paragraphs 0064-Page 9, paragraph 0068 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the

method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claims 12 and 15-17, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 2 and 5-7. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 2 and 5-7.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Silva discloses a method in which a user request is received by a voice server and in response a HTTP request (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). The HTML document is received in response to the request and the document is translated into VoiceXML, at which point a voice server converts it to audible form and presents it to the user (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva). Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). Silva discloses a method in which a user profile, which includes user default options, is interpreted from a database (Page 3, paragraphs 0026-0029 of Silva).

Silva does not disclose a method of partitioning the HTML document into a plurality of text sections and link sections. However, Johnson discloses a method in which an HTML document is partitioned into a plurality of text sections and link sections (Page 2, paragraphs 0028-0029 and Page 5, paragraphs 0067-0069). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of

Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made and it would have allowed for each section to be analyzed and processed under different standards.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Silva discloses a method in which a plurality of audible cues available for audible selection (earcons) is provided to differentiate between sections of the HTML document (Page 8, paragraphs 0064-Page 9, paragraph 0068 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Silva discloses a method in which a text summarization is performed on text sections of HTML page in which text highlights, which present important clauses, are provided (Page 5, paragraphs 0038-0040 and Page 6, paragraphs 0049-0051 of Silva). As shown in the included definition of java server pages it is well known to use JSPs for formatting dynamic web pages (definition of Java Server Pages from Free On-Line Dictionary Of Computing). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have used JSPs with the method of dynamically formatting web pages of Silva because

it was well known in the art to use JSPs for dynamic formatting of HTML pages at the

time the invention was made.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Silva discloses a method in which an HTML

parser parses the HTML and corrects ill-formed HTML documents (Page 4, paragraphs

0031-0032 of Silva).

10.   Claims 3, 13, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Silva et al. (hereinafter Silva, US Patent Application Publication Number

2002/0054090, filed on August 30, 2001) in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson,

US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0165955, filed on May 2, 2001) as

applied to claims 2, 12, and 24 above, and further in view of Mr. Cluey ("How can I find

out how many hyperlinks there are on a page?" published on September 10, 2000).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 13, and 25, neither Silva nor Johnson disclose

a method in which the link density are used to determine the existence of link sections.

However, Mr. Cluey discloses a method in which a document is segmented into

components and the amount of links in each component is counted (Page 1-3,

"Counting all Links"). Mr. Cluey discloses that the amount of links is obtained (Page 1-3

"Counting all Links"), thus determining if it is a link section. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined

the methods of Silva and Johnson with the method of Mr. Cluey because it would have

allowed the user to know exactly how many hyperlinks existed in each section of the page.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US Patent Number 6,182,092

US Patent Number 6,442,523

US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0091524

US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0023440

US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0046316

Introduction and Overview of W3C Speech Inteface Framework,

by Jim A. Larson

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
December 6, 2004

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100